

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed July 10, 2007 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 63-67, 69, 71-72, 74-77 have been amended to further particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter regarded as the invention. Support for the changes may be found in the specification, such as in paragraphs [0020], [0023], and [0033], among others. New Claims 78-81 also particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter regarded as the invention. Support for these claims may be found in the specification, such as in paragraphs [0020], [0023], and [0033], among others.

Claim 62 has been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.

The 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph Rejection

Claims 60-72 and 74-76 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the office action states that the “newly added limitation ‘said candle not requiring removable colored plastic inserts for changing the color that is displayed’ is not disclosed in the Specifications.” This objection is respectfully traversed.

The Specification states, in addition to other paragraphs, that in “prior art devices this cylindrical sleeve would have been tinted or treated with a film in order to transmit light of a particular color from a first light source disposed within a lower region of candle such as an incandescent bulb. In the present invention the sleeve 126 may be translucent or transparent.” (Paragraph [0019]). Thus, the candle does not require removable colored plastic inserts for changing the color that is displayed. Rather, the candle utilizes translucent or transparent sleeve.

Thus, since the Specification provides for the added claim limitation, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

The 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 60-72 and 74-77 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoorn et al. (USP 5,605,506) and further in view of Lys et al. (USP 6,897,624) and Irving (USP 3,987,401), among which claims 74-76 are independent claims. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The combination of prior art references do not teach each and every claim limitation and there is no reasonable expectation of success that the alleged combination of Hoorn, Lys and Irving would result in the claimed invention and can not be said to render the claimed invention obvious for the reasons, among others, discussed below.

Amended Claim 74 provides for the following features:

- displaying a selection menu on a display at a remote network, the selection menu having a list of illumination instructions and a list of triggering events;
- receiving an input signal by the remote network to associate one of the illumination instructions with at least one of the triggering events;
- transmitting the input signal from the remote network to a plurality of gaming machines, each of the plurality of gaming machines having a processor therein to control a plurality of gaming machine functions;
- receiving the input signal by the processor, the input signal having the illumination instruction associated with at least one of the triggering events;
- storing the input signal in the processor;
- detecting a triggering event by the processor based upon one of the plurality of gaming machine functions;
- transmitting an illumination instruction signal associated with the detected triggering event from the processor to a candle mounted on the gaming machine, the candle having a plurality of colored LEDs;
- illuminating the plurality of colored LEDs;
- programming the processor to operate one or more of the colored LEDs to provide a selected color illumination pattern based upon the transmitted illumination instruction signal.

Amended Claims 75, 76 and new Claim 78 provide for similar features. As provided in the Specification, the candle may be programmed from a remote location and a processor may be used to control all the functions of the gaming machine such as determining the triggering event based upon the functions of the gaming machine, the candle, and the like. (Specification, paragraphs [0033] and [0023]). Thus, the processor is able to receive an input signal from the remote network, the input signal having the illumination instruction and the associated triggering event, detect a triggering event by the processor based upon one of the plurality of gaming

machine functions, and transmit an illumination instruction signal associated with the detected triggering event from the processor to the candle. (Specification, paragraphs [0023] and [0033]).

The combination of Hoorn, Lys, and Irving does not teach all the claim limitations. The combination does not teach “transmitting the input signal from the remote network to a plurality of gaming machines, each of the plurality of gaming machines having a processor therein to control a plurality of gaming machine functions”, “receiving the input signal by the processor, the input signal having the illumination instruction associated with at least one of the triggering events”; “storing the input signal in the processor”; “detecting a triggering event by the processor based upon one of the plurality of gaming machine functions”, nor “transmitting an illumination instruction signal associated with the detected triggering event from the processor to a candle mounted on the gaming machine, the candle having a plurality of colored LEDs.” Rather, the alleged combination merely teaches transmitting transmission signals to an antenna coupled to the candle. The antenna does not control any gaming machine functions nor does the antenna detect any triggering events in order to illuminate the candle.

Additionally, the alleged combination of Hoorn, Lys, and Irving would not result in the claimed invention. The alleged combination would simply result in an candle having an antenna that merely receives and transmits transmission signals. The antenna would not control any gaming machine functions, store the input signals, or determine a triggering event to transmit an illumination instruction signal. Thus, the alleged combination would not result in “transmitting the input signal from the remote network to a plurality of gaming machines, each of the plurality of gaming machines having a processor therein to control a plurality of gaming machine functions ... storing the input signal in the processor ... programming the processor to operate one or more of the colored LEDs within said first stage to provide a selected color illumination pattern based upon the transmitted illumination instruction signal.”

As to dependent Claims 60-72, 77, and 79-81, the argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited and Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant hereby petitions for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No. IGT1P339).

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER LLP

/Adrienne Yeung/
Adrienne Yeung
Registration No. 44,000

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(408) 255-8001